



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

who are interested in their work, and may have the effect of discouraging unpromising material.

Department morale. The question of morale and *esprit de corps* enters into department organization. The cataloger needs to respect her work and to realize that it is both an important branch of the library service and one in which she can develop and can remain to advantage. This is particularly important in view of the present tendency to cry down cataloging, and exalt other branches of the service at its expense. An organization which provides for informal department staff meetings in which each member has a chance to learn something about the department as a whole and to see how her own little piece of work fits into the department and also into the service of the public may be made to help greatly. The larger the department the more the need of disseminating such information. Catalogers are prone to get into a rut since they are especially shut off from outside information, and need to be encouraged to keep up with the broader aspects of the work, both in their own libraries and in other libraries as well.

Some reference to the A. L. A. catalog-

ing test may not be amiss here. This test dealt primarily with the cost of cataloging and furnished little information, except incidentally, about departmental organization. An inspection both of the earlier questionnaire reports and the later record cards indicates a pretty general agreement, or at least a majority practice, on a few points. These are: (1) Systematic use of Library of Congress cards; (2) a majority practice of full time work within the department and little scheduling of catalog assistants in other departments (with certain notable exceptions, such as Cincinnati and Yale); (3) the existence in larger libraries of some type of graded service. In actual practice the libraries participating in the test may be in agreement on many other points of organization not brought out in the test.

In suggesting the foregoing points of organization the writer has, in general, tried to present them as questions rather than as conclusions, in the hope that so presented they will be more likely to draw out discussion and statements of practice from well organized departments. Definite statements of this sort will be most helpful, even though in the end they go to show that no one standard form of organization is applicable to all types of libraries.

STUDY OF DEPARTMENTAL LIBRARIES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, 1912-1917—OBSERVATIONS AND EXPERIENCES

By J. C. M. HANSON, *Associate Director, University of Chicago Libraries*

Whatever the writer may have to say on this occasion will be supplementary to his statements before the College and Reference Section, 1912, and printed in the A. L. A. Bulletin, Conference number, of that year.

There is little to add to the summary then outlined. One who has for six years been struggling with unsatisfactory conditions resulting from twenty years of unrestricted development of departmental

libraries without adequate coördination, supervision, equipment or force, may be in some danger of emphasizing the disadvantages of the system rather than the reverse. Among the more serious drawbacks may be noted the following: Necessarily inadequate catalogs supplied for departmental libraries; lack of reference books, and in general, insufficient help and equipment, usually a necessary accompaniment of extreme decentralization. The in-

creasing difficulties of administration, the greater expenditure of money without commensurate returns where many and extensive departmental libraries must be maintained, represent obvious additional weaknesses.

The loss to departments disposed to rely almost entirely on their departmental libraries, in not having access to the catalogs and reference collections of the general library, naturally increases in proportion as these catalogs and collections are developed and perfected.

In this connection the writer may as well state at the outset that he has not so far been able to discover any specific which will influence the professor, accustomed for the better part of a generation to work only in his department, toward utilizing the resources of the central library. The same holds true in general also of students. Occasionally, of late, graduate students from certain departments have discovered that there is something for them also in the general library building. A steady increase has been noted in the number of applications for stack permits coming from such students. Perhaps this is an indication that the members of the departments are gradually awakening to the fact that the central library may after all have something to offer which shall merit an occasional visit, and that this may in time produce a more general appreciation of the advantages offered by a large general collection adequately cataloged and classified, reasonably well administered, and with a somewhat modern library equipment.

The writer begs to call attention to a report on the departmental library conditions at the University of Chicago now being printed. This report is in the main the result of investigation and study of the problems by a subcommittee of the library board, consisting of Professor Manly, head of the English Department, Professor Parker, of the School of Education, and the undersigned, representing the University Libraries and acting as

secretary of the committee and the editor of its report.

The main part of the publication referred to is based on a questionnaire addressed to twenty-five American university libraries, of which twenty-four responded. The report, which will be distributed freely to those interested, will give a better idea of the conditions of the departmental libraries at The University of Chicago, and to some extent also in the universities responding, than any statement which might be presented here. Reference to existing conditions will therefore, for the most part, be omitted from the present paper; so also discussion of the general history of departmental book collections, and the theories and ideas underlying their development.

The questions put to the twenty-five university libraries cover the following points:

1. Number of departmental libraries, and the number of volumes in each or all of them.
2. Control of assignment of books to such libraries.
3. Distribution of book funds by department or subject.
4. Regulations governing withdrawal of books from the general library for the use of a departmental library, also transfer of books from one library to another.
5. Return of books withdrawn for use of a departmental library.
6. Method of paying for books ordered by a department outside of its own field of study.
7. Location of books ordered by a department outside of its field of study.
8. Separation of the different editions of the same work, or the various parts or series of the same set or publication.
9. Limitations as to size of a departmental library.
10. Admission to departmental libraries.
11. Representation of books in departmental libraries in the catalogs of the general library.
12. Classification of departmental libraries.

13. Supervision and staff.

A summary of the answers received gives the following results:

1. Of twenty-four libraries responding, the great majority hold the bulk of their books in the general library, only small, selected collections being kept in departments. In addition to the University of Chicago, Johns Hopkins, Illinois, Indiana and Texas seem to have the major part of their book resources distributed to departments. While Columbia and Harvard house in departmental or professional libraries 200,000 and 350,000 volumes respectively, more than two-thirds of their collections remain in the general library.

2. In the majority of libraries the assignment of books to departmental libraries is under control of the librarian, usually working in connection with the library committee or library council.

3. The division and allotment of book funds is usually under central control—in most cases of a library committee of which the librarian may be chairman or secretary. The funds are allotted by subjects rather than by departments. In some universities, e. g. Iowa and Nebraska, there is no division either by subjects or departments, the understanding being that each department submits orders for all books wanted, purchases being made as far as the funds permit, care always being taken that the expenditure for any one department does not reach an unreasonable amount. In addition to Chicago, Indiana and Texas seem to be the universities in which distribution by departments is still favored.

4. Withdrawal of books from general library for use of departments, and transfers from one department to another, are usually arranged by the librarian in consultation with the department concerned, the library committee being called upon to settle difficult cases.

5. Books are usually returned to the general library when not much used, the matter being arranged by the librarian in consultation with the department. There seems to be no definite rule as to the time for return of books loaned to departments. Presumably, if not called for by other departments or individuals, they are allowed to remain in the departmental library for an indefinite period. In a few instances, books are returned to the general library once a year.

6. The cost of a book is usually charged against the department which orders it, or against the subject covered by the book,

unless there is a special fund for the subject or department. Most answers indicate that the department which orders pays, provided always that there is a departmental book fund.

7. The fact that a book is purchased on recommendation of a department and paid for out of its appropriation does not, in a majority of libraries, decide the location of the book. Such books are, when of general interest, usually shelved in the general library.

8. Different editions of the same book and different books on exactly the same subject or the same phase of the same subject are usually kept together in one library, exceptions being few and the separation in these cases usually temporary. Sets of the same periodical or of the proceedings and transactions of the same society are not separated.

9. Space and funds available usually determine the size of the departmental library. In one case the limit is reported as 200 volumes; in others, there is a general regulation that the collections in departments shall be limited strictly to working books; in still others, the size is regulated by the library committee, the librarian and the president.

10. Access is usually free to all students without distinction. In some cases it is granted only to graduate students; in others, to graduate students of the department and to all members of the faculty. In some cases, the librarian issues cards to individuals. Again, the matter may be arranged with the department concerned.

11-12. The aim is in general to have all books in departmental libraries represented in all catalogs of the general library and to have a uniform system of classification for all libraries.

13. The largest and most important departmental libraries usually have regular trained assistants. The others are looked after by members of the faculty, the secretary of the head of the department, or by student help, as the case may be.

After careful study of the answers and such other material as came to hand, the subcommittee formulated a series of recommendations which, after much discussion and rather severe handling by the rest of the board, were finally trimmed down into a number of general recommendations and specific resolutions duly adopted and incorporated in the Rules and Regulations of the Libraries, printed in

April, 1917. A copy of these rules will be sent to anyone interested.

The resolutions emphasize the following points:

1. All the libraries of the university constitute the University Libraries, under the general administration of the director.

2. The departmental libraries contain books especially needed in connection with the work of investigation and instruction of a particular department, group of departments, school or college of the university. In case of difference of opinion the field of each departmental library is defined by the library board. Libraries which require books outside their special field use the general library or other departmental libraries and do not attempt the development of a general library. The collections of such libraries are confined to the subjects determined upon, and such reference books as are needed frequently enough to warrant their duplication. Any departmental library may borrow books from the general library and from other departmental libraries as needed.

3. All books in all libraries of the university are the property of the university and belong to the University Libraries. Books acquired by gift or exchange are assigned by the director to the general library or to a departmental library, subject, in the case of gifts, to the conditions under which they have been accepted from the donor. Appeal may be made from the decision of the director to the board of libraries.

(a) All books belonging to the libraries are as far as practicable located where they are likely to be of most service, whether in the general library or in a departmental library.

(b) Books of interest to several departments, by whatever departments recommended or to whatever account charged, are assigned by the director to the general library or other library in which it is judged that they will be of the greatest service. The department that has recommended the purchase is notified of the location of the book, provided it is assigned to another library. When cataloged, a printed or multigraphed card is supplied for the library of the department which has recommended the purchase. In no case of such diversion of a new book to a library other than the one from which the order came is the cost of the book charged against the appropriation of the department originally ordering it, unless by agreement of that department.

(c) The first or only set of a given

periodical, or of the reports, proceedings, or transactions of a society, institution, or government office, is not in general divided between libraries, but, after consultation with the libraries concerned, assigned as a whole to that library in which it is judged that it will be of the greatest service. In cases in which broken sets already exist, the director has authority to locate them in the general library or other library in which they are likely to be of the greatest service. Appeal from the director's decision may be made to the board of libraries.

(d) Duplicates may be located in different libraries according to need. Different editions of the same book, different lives of the same individual, etc., are as far as possible shelved together. Only in special cases to be decided by the director may lives of the same person or different editions of the same book be separated.

(e) Books no longer needed in a departmental library are returned to the general library.

(f) Books are temporarily transferred from one library to another on agreement of the representatives of the libraries immediately concerned, and approved by the director, and charged as in the case of other loans.

Distribution of book funds by subject rather than by department, urged by the subcommittee, was not adopted.

What more perhaps than any action of the library board has tended to improve conditions somewhat is the fact that the departments of the Historical Group and of Philosophy, and the Modern Languages, are now housed in the same building with the general library. As the collections of these departments have been gradually recataloged and reclassified, there has come to pass a merging of their book resources which has tended to enlarge the number of subjects with which their students come into contact during their researches in the library.

Unfortunately, the main library building is too small even for the collections which it now contains. Some day History and the Modern Languages, perhaps also Philosophy, will move into adjoining buildings of their own. Connecting with these buildings, and with the general library, will be that of the Classic and Oriental departments already erected, also the new

building planned for the Divinity School. Whether the departmental spirit of seclusion and exclusion will tend to reassert itself under these new conditions remains to be seen. It is hoped that the reorganization of the library, now under way, will by that time have advanced far enough to demonstrate the usefulness of having the book resources of a given subject in one place, not scattered about in eight or nine different buildings or libraries as was the case, for instance, with books on the fine arts, under the old order.

One department likely to remain outside of the group here referred to is Geography. If that department were included, it would be possible to look forward to a somewhat homogeneous development of libraries, at any rate for the departments which constitute the so-called humanities. Including as it does economic, historical, military, commercial, mathematical and scientific geography, economic and natural resources, commerce, agriculture, history, description, social life and the like, the separation of this library from the above group is likely to give trouble and lead to extensive duplication.

The experience of the University of Chicago since 1911 points to the fact that departments whose collections are brought together in the same building are likely to favor a consolidation of all the resources on the same subject, provided always that an orderly system of classification and cataloging is applied in a reasonably scholarly and scientific manner. In other words, no department whose library has so far been recataloged and merged with that of other departments and the general library is likely, after a year's test of the new plan, to look with favor on a return to the old order. On the other hand, departments located in other buildings, even though the distance from the central library may be less than a hundred feet, show as yet little tendency to recede from the position held for so many years. Only in isolated cases have such departments expressed a willingness to have books pur-

chased for their departments, but on subjects obviously outside of their special field, located in the general library building.

The writer is, however, inclined to view the situation with considerable optimism. He feels that there cannot fail to be a gradual change of heart on the part of many departments. The spirit of the times calls for coöperation, coördination and correlation of resources, economy and efficiency of management, and the best possible results for the least expenditure of money. No one can deny that the development and upkeep of separate libraries, covering almost identically the same field of knowledge, in different buildings barely a stone's throw apart, means greater cost and less efficiency than where such collections are merged into one. It represents a situation, the continuance of which is not likely to be looked upon with favor by university administrators who have noted the tendency of the times and have come to see the importance of a strong central library.

In Washington, the Federal Government has long recognized the fact that libraries of government departments and offices must rely on the Library of Congress or other departmental libraries for most of the material outside of their own individual fields of investigation, and this in spite of the fact that they are in many instances located two miles or more away from the Library of Congress or other libraries likely to be of assistance. Similarly, the various sections and departments of a large city government do not to-day attempt the development each of its own separate bureau of legislative experts. The wisdom of centralization and coördination of library resources on the same or related subjects is so obvious to the experienced librarian, that it seems almost unnecessary to devote time to it at a conference like the present one.

To illustrate the possible saving through centralization, it may not be out of place to cite here a concrete example from the

reorganization now being carried out at the University of Chicago.

Under the old order, the Historical Group library, numbering in 1911 about 59,000 volumes, had a staff consisting of four regular assistants on full time, the salaries ranging from \$50 to \$70 per month, and in addition, a large number of student assistants working on part time, usually ten hours a week. In 1917, with the Historical Group library fully reclassified and recataloged, and merged with that of the general library, and in part also with that of the Modern Languages, Philosophy and Education, a conservative estimate places the bound volumes standing under subjects properly belonging to this Group at 130,000, and in addition an unknown number of pamphlets. While the number of volumes has therefore more than doubled, one attendant at a salary of \$45 per month handles the delivery desk and reading room of this group with reasonable efficiency. Of the former assistants, two are now on the staff of the general library, and two have resigned. The explanation of this reduction in force is of course that the staff of the general library has been able to take over the cataloging, classification and shelving of the books obtained for these departments, and also a considerable part of the reference work. It is no doubt true that hundreds of volumes on art, literature, law and similar subjects, originally purchased for the Historical Group library, have been detached from its collections and placed with their proper subjects in other parts of the building; but these losses have been made up several times over by additions, mainly from the general library, of books on history, geography, and the social sciences. No one can deny that all this has meant a great increase in the working efficiency of the group, and I dare say that there is no member of the faculties of these departments who would now vote for a return to the old system, were that possible. There is no reason to suppose that other groups or departments which in turn may have to

undergo the same experience as History will not, on emerging from the ordeal, find themselves similarly benefited.

The writer has been informed that his criticism in 1912 of certain features of departmental libraries as developed at the University of Chicago has led some to think that he was opposed to all departmental libraries. Nothing could be farther from the truth. In his opinion, departmental collections, larger or smaller, according to the needs and conditions governing each particular case, have come to stay. Especially in large universities, where distances from one department to another, or between the department and the general library, are sometimes sufficient to render the use of a central collection difficult, and particularly where the books needed in the department are not likely to duplicate or overlap with those required by other departments, it is no doubt right and proper that a departmental library should be established and maintained. It may likewise be granted that in such cases the departmental library should be given some latitude and freedom of development. Where, on the other hand, only a scant hundred feet separates the departmental building from the general library, and particularly where work of the department is in fields likely to overlap or parallel those of other departments, the situation becomes quite different. The writer grants that even here there should be a reference library and reading room, provided always that the university can stand the expense, the reference books in this case, however, to consist largely of duplicate copies of books already in the possession of the general library. To permit such a department to build up a library of from 10,000 to 50,000 volumes or more, can be justified solely on the ground that the subjects taught in the department will not require the removal or detachment from the general library of large numbers of books wanted also by other departments. It may be permitted, for instance, for a divinity library to have in its departmental building the main col-

lections of books dealing with religion and theology, or even in certain cases books on the description and history of countries or sections of paramount interest to the missionary student; but to allow the same library to build up also large collections on general history, sociology, ethics, education, philology and literature, when there are far better libraries on these subjects within fifty yards of the Divinity building, the latter perhaps, as at the University of Chicago, connecting directly with the general library building, seems utterly wasteful and indefensible. It represents an expenditure of funds wholly unwarranted by the slight advantage of convenience to a small group of instructors and students, an advantage which is moreover largely offset by the distinct loss to these same students in not being brought into contact with and not learning to utilize the larger and more comprehensive collections in the general library. Naturally there is also to be reckoned the loss to other students caused by the withdrawal from the general library of sections of books which might reasonably be looked for in that library rather than in a department.

These arguments for centralization of book resources on the same or related subjects will usually appeal to the university administrator, provided always that they are backed up by clear and definite proofs, which show a distinct saving of money, provided also that the traditions of independence and solidarity of departments have not become so deeply rooted that attempts at forcing a change are likely to cause unpleasant feelings among members of departments most directly affected.

It is unfortunately not always an easy matter to demonstrate to busy men, not specialists in library administration, that centralization really represents a saving. Often the departmental libraries have been built up and administered by student help, without trained or salaried assistants, cataloging, shelving and binding expenses having been cut to the lowest possible

minimum. When such collections are taken over for the purpose of reorganization on modern and stable lines by a professional force, the cost of administration is at first likely to rise. Moreover, the administrator may not readily see that it is infinitely more difficult to reorganize such a library than to deal with an entirely new collection of equal size.

Basing his remarks in part on his experiences in connection with the reorganization on which he has been engaged for the last five years the writer will call attention to a few of the results likely to obtain, whenever large departmental collections are permitted to develop somewhat independently, without adequate help or experienced supervision.

The reclassification and recataloging of such departmental libraries, and the necessary investigation into the somewhat varied collections of books brought together during the several years of their existence, are sure to reveal conditions which it is believed are likely to be repeated whenever departmental libraries are built up under similar conditions.

Even where such libraries have adopted for their catalogs cards of the so-called international size, three by five inches, the cataloging is pretty sure to have been carried on for the most part by students without experience, working without supervision or general control and with no special attempt at coördination of the results. As may be expected, the catalogs will be found so defective as to render them practically useless in connection with a possible reorganization. As for classification, some libraries may have adopted, say the decimal classification without any modification, using perhaps one of the older editions. Other libraries may have modified the "decimal" to suit their individual needs, and while in many respects the modification may represent an improvement on the original, the fact that the numbers have been given a totally different meaning from that of the regular classification will make it difficult to utilize the "Decimal" in the reorganization. Other libraries, again

will have adopted a letter or letters to designate classes, but without consulting other libraries also using letters, the result being that the same letter may stand for Political Economy in one department, for Mineralogy in another.

In the purchase of books there will be evident lack of coöperation, several libraries developing collections of books on the same subjects without any effective check on duplication.

Sets of the same periodicals may be taken by different libraries without assurance of a complete set except through consolidation of two or three of them. Systematic efforts to fill gaps or even to keep up current sets are sure to be lacking. Publications of societies and institutions, reports of government departments and bureaus will be found to be incomplete. Lives of the same individual by different authors will turn up in three to four different libraries, various editions of the same book in different departments.

Books have often been permitted to accumulate without being bound or cataloged, the result being that signatures, title-pages, indexes, entire parts or numbers and even volumes, are lost. Libraries have outgrown their quarters, leading to methods of shelving and storage which must cause damage to the books.

Owing to the large number of libraries requiring separate reading rooms, attendants and equipment, the funds appropriated may not have been sufficient to go around, the result being employment of inadequate and inexperienced help, inferior and insufficient equipment, and consequently inefficient service.

One of the most serious aspects of the situation will, however, be the difficulty under existing conditions, first of finding what material may be available on a given subject, and finally of bringing that material together for the use of a given student or body of students.

The departments, while realizing, no doubt, the need of some reorganization and readjustments, will, at least in some cases,

be rather reluctant to give up anything purchased on their appropriations or once installed as part of their libraries. Particularly the scientific departments are prone to look on their libraries as quite as necessary for their work as laboratories and similar equipment, and are opposed to the removal of any considerable section of them to the general library.

No doubt all the departments may have begun their work with a general understanding that purchases were to be kept within certain limits, e. g. History to develop history, not agriculture and art, etc. Without a strong central check the departments, however, are likely to buy in general what an instructor in the department has occasion to refer to in connection with his classes or lectures, the only real check being the limits of the departmental book appropriation.

To the experienced librarian it may seem clear enough that the mistakes involved in the building of department libraries in the manner here indicated are twofold, first, the development of departmental libraries by inexperienced and insufficient help prior to the institution of a strong central library; second, giving the departments a free hand and not appointing a competent body to act as a check on purchases. In other words, the mistakes made are not likely to be repeated. At the same time, it seems to the writer, by no means unlikely that there is danger of a similar situation resulting whenever a university has on its faculty aggressive and ambitious heads of departments not familiar with the technical side of library administration, men who have difficulty, therefore, in seeing any danger in the acquisition by their particular library of publications which, strictly speaking, are either too general for a departmental library, or touch the field of some other department rather than their own. The natural tendency is to give in to a strong and emphatic demand that such exceptions be made, and when the door has once been opened, it is difficult to refuse a second

and a third request. The result is that in the course of twenty or thirty years we have a departmental library whose chief strength is as yet, no doubt, represented by the subject for which the department stands, but which has gradually branched out also into other subjects until it is more and more usurping the functions of the general library.

With this branching out has come the unavoidable demand for additional funds for books, for equipment and force, for space in which to house its collections. With ten to twenty departments all engaged in healthy rivalry, it is not difficult to see that expenditures for books and libraries are under such circumstances likely to rise to a point where the authorities must call a halt. With retrenchments in the appropriations come various questionable economies of administration, some of which have been incidentally alluded to above. Experience shows that the department is loath to cut down its purchases. It prefers to economize by omitting the binding of books, by hiring cheaper help and adding cheaper equipment, the inevitable result of which is loss of books, deterioration in service and a general lowering of efficiency.

Having pointed out the dangers of independent development of departmental libraries, it may be in order to consider the practical working out of various attempts at coördination of the libraries and their administration by central authority.

The Prussian universities were the first to take up in some systematic manner the relations of the central and the departmental libraries. Among the German university librarians who have contributed to the discussion is Dr. Milkau, director of the University Library at Breslau. In his opinion, the final solution lies in setting a definite limit to the number of volumes which a departmental library can have on its shelves. Some such arbitrary rule as this may be possible of application in a German university under government control. Whether departmental heads in American universities could be persuaded

to abide by a similar ruling would probably depend not a little on tradition or the habits of the particular university community. At best, one familiar with American character is likely to be a little skeptical as regards its successful enforcement.

Speaking, then, from the standpoint of the American university, it would seem better, at least for the present, not to attempt any arbitrary limitation of the development of a departmental library. Instead, efforts might be directed towards the coördination of their book resources. A uniform system of classification and catalogs is naturally one of the first essentials of such coördination; so also a clear demarcation of the field of knowledge and a specification of subjects allotted to a given department with clear indication of exceptions to be permitted.

How far may a library duplicate its central catalog for the use of a department? Unfortunately, a full printed catalog, author and subject, kept up to date by frequent cumulative supplements, is today beyond the reach of even the wealthiest institution. Our reliance must, as a rule, be the card or manuscript catalog, and here again it is difficult to make the head of a department see the great difficulties connected with a duplication of the central catalog, or at any rate those sections of it likely to interest his particular department.

A number of American universities have tended towards the development of the departmental catalog by transfer to it of certain classes of entries previously added to the central catalog, e. g., analytical entries for collections and serial publications of particular interest to the department. In other words, a catalog of the departmental library is to be developed, to some extent at least, at the expense of the central or main catalog. This would seem to be a questionable policy. It means that the dispersion of the book resources is to be followed by the disruption also of the catalog, the last link, as it were, between the general library and the departments. The attitude of the librarian is

naturally favorable to the full and complete development of every catalog; but when this has to be accomplished at the expense of the central catalog, it becomes a question of policy to which most careful consideration must be given. To the writer it would seem of prime importance that there should be at least one place on the campus where information might be obtained in regard to all the book resources of the university, and the logical place for such a center should be the general library, rather than the departments.

Another point in the cataloging practice on which more light is needed, is the extent to which one can and should go in attempting to represent in the general catalog books located in the departments, and vice versa, how far entries for books in the general library or in another departmental library should be made to appear in the catalog of a particular department.

We may grant that a union catalog to contain at least one author or title entry for every book in departmental libraries is a desideratum or even a necessity; also that the proper place for this catalog is the general library. There may be differences of opinion, however, as regards the advisability of extending the scope of the catalog so as to include also subject entries for all books in the university. Furthermore, it is doubtful whether it will be found possible to carry over into a series of departmental catalogs much information about books in other libraries. It is no doubt a satisfaction to know that books on a given subject may be found in nearby libraries whence they can be brought within a reasonable time, but there are great difficulties connected with this plan. For instance, experience has shown that the public in consulting a catalog does not readily distinguish between books located in departmental libraries and those found in the main library or vice versa, and as a result there is dissatisfaction. Then again, the expense involved in this wholesale duplication of cataloging records is

one of which only the few who have had practical experience with it can have any adequate idea.

Aside from actual duplication of records one must take into account the frequent change of location of books assigned to departments, and the consequent cost of recording these changes on the various entries in the central and departmental catalogs. Tests have shown that when many copies of the entry must be dealt with, the cost of this item alone runs from twenty-five to thirty-five cents per title. The alternative of omitting from the catalog entry all indication of the department in which the book is located and relying upon the charging card to furnish the information, has also its obvious drawbacks. In the library with which the writer is connected the plan so far followed has been to catalog in full a book located in a departmental library and indicate its location on author and subject cards in the public catalogs (both a dictionary and a classed catalog being in process of compilation). Although it is foreseen that the day may come when thousands of books will be turned back to the central library by departments pressed for space, it has not as yet seemed advisable to limit the number of entries in the main catalog or to omit note of location from all or a part of them.

Such then are some of the problems to be reckoned with in the expansion and increase of departmental libraries. Departments must and will have books. They cannot wait for buildings, catalogs, trained help or other essentials of sound library management. Nowhere, therefore, does it seem more important than in a large university, that there should be at the outset a central library strong enough to care for current accessions. Most, perhaps, all, university librarians agree in the main with Mr. Lyster's resolution before the Congress at Brussels in 1910,* which in free translation reads as follows:

*Congrès de Bruxelles, 1910. Actes, p. 724-726.

"It is not desirable to dismember a large general library and deprive it of one or more of its sections; a large general library resembles a university and differs from the small special library as does a university from a school of technology. Its usefulness is lost if it is dismembered."

At the same time we know that, as already stated in this paper, a large university must have its departmental libraries, consisting of larger or smaller collections of books, according to the needs of each particular case. The existence of this need, however, does not justify a department in proceeding to build its library as if this particular department and its library constituted the entire university, with no other library or department within a radius of a hundred miles.

While there are no doubt many, even among those here present, who believe that a strict adherence to the idea conveyed by Mr. Lyster's resolution—to permit no separation or detachment of any section of a university library from its regular place in the central building—would yield the best results for the least money, the demands of the teaching and research departments of our large universities are coming to be such that it would probably prove impossible for any institution, in the long run, to hold strictly to this principle. Theoretically it may well be the ideal towards which each university library should strive. No doubt all the books should as far as possible be classified and cataloged

as though parts of one single harmonious unit. In practice, however, some portion of them are likely to be loaned for definite or indefinite periods, to form more or less extensive departmental libraries.

Possibly mechanical or other technical devices may in time facilitate and simplify connection and communication between a distinct department and the central Library to such an extent that all the problems with which the present paper has endeavored to deal shall be solved; but until that has come to pass, the writer, knowing that the ideal—a large general library with strong departmental libraries consisting solely of duplicates, each library with its building, and up-to-date catalog—is impossible of attainment, would be highly pleased to see realized as a second choice, a large central library from which books may be borrowed for longer or shorter periods to supply the more urgent needs of a department. A third alternative which might be mentioned would call for the second plan, but with the privilege of loan extended to include, especially in the case of certain scientific departments, also the main classes of books representing the subjects taught in these departments.

Whether the first plan, to which the system of the Clark University library most nearly approximates; the second or third, or some compromise between the three, is to be adopted, becomes an administrative matter to be settled by each university according to its lights and its means.

A PLAN FOR A CENSUS OF RESEARCH RESOURCES

BY CLEMENT W. ANDREWS, *Librarian the John Crerar Library, Chicago*

It is evident that the fact that a collection is called special by the library, possessing it, is no guarantee that it is of special value to a scholar. On the other hand, a list of these special collections is by no means exhaustive of any subject, for even if the holdings of all special libraries—for example, those of natural history so-

cieties and the medical societies—were listed, there would still remain those of the larger public libraries, the general reference libraries and above all, the libraries in Washington. The proposition I submit, therefore, is that a census be taken of all these resources, so that scholars may be able to ascertain all the places where con-